

**ASSESSMENT OF THE MICROBIAL POPULATIONS AND CHEMICAL
CHARACTERISTICS OF PARAQUAT TREATED SOIL**

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed at assessing the microbial population and chemical components of paraquat treated soils. The soil samples were treated with the low (0.3 ml/L), recommended (0.6 ml/L) and high (0.9 ml/L) doses of paraquat respectively. Microbial and chemical assessments were carried out using standard procedures. The results of the study showed that, microbes such as *Staphylococcus* sp., *Micrococcus* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Escherichia coli*, *Bacillus* sp., *Actinomycetes bovis*, *Actinomycetes israeli*, *Streptomyces* sp., *Aspergillus fumigatus*, *Aspergillus niger*, *Aspergillus flavus*, *Absidia corymbifera* and *Rhizopus stolonifer* were found present in the paraquat treated soils of different doses with the control soil samples having most of the fungal species isolated. The application of the paraquat to the soils at different weeks after application (WAA) affected the microbes as most were found absent in some of the treated soil samples and this was proved by the result of the control soil samples. The organic matter and carbon contents of the paraquat treated soils were at the 4th WAA had the significantly ($P=.05$) highest contents with 1.93 %, 1.93 % and 1.84 % and 1.34 %, 1.12 % and 1.12 % respectively whereas the pH of the soils was at 2nd WAA the highest compared to those of the other soils at other WAA as well as the control soils. Different doses of paraquat at different WAA affect soil microbial populations as well as the chemical components of the soil. So, the effects of paraquat on soil microbial population and chemical components depended on the concentrations used and the duration of application.

24 Since the fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes species identified in this study were sensitive to
25 herbicide application, they may serve as a reliable indicator of the biological value of soils.

26 **Key words:** Herbicide, soil, effect, determination, microbial population

27 1.0 INTRODUCTION

28 Herbicides are chemical compounds that are used to kill unwanted plants. These are used to
29 clear waste grounds, industrial sites, railways and farm lands [14]. Prior to the wide spread
30 use of chemical herbicides, cultural controls such as altering soil pH and fertility levels were
31 used to control weeds. Mechanical control (including tillage) was also (and still is) used to
32 control weeds [14]. Today, chemical herbicides are used by farmers in order to control
33 weeds, thus increasing their plant production. Without the use of these herbicides, control of
34 weeds would not have been easy and the effects, one of which is hunger and food shortage as
35 a result of the weeds affecting plant production, would have been more serious than the
36 Ecotoxicological effect which they are intended [5]. Numerous experiments have been
37 conducted that demonstrated the potential positive impacts of the use of herbicides by
38 farmers; for instance; maize yields double and production costs fell by 61% in Nigeria [6].
39 [20] Also reported in Nigeria that the cost of weed control in rice with herbicides was 50%
40 lower than hoe weeding.

41 In achieving the optimization of agricultural resources thus satisfying human needs and at the
42 same time maintaining the quality of the environment and sustaining natural resources, the
43 soil microbial community composition is of great importance, because they play a crucial role
44 in carbon flow, nutrient cycling and litter decomposition, which in turn affect soil fertility and
45 plant growth [8, 23, 16].

46 However, despite the benefits of using these herbicides by farmers as noted by [5] and [19],
47 the increased use of herbicides in agricultural soils causes the contamination of the soil with

48 toxic chemicals, thus may exert certain effects on non-target organisms including soil
49 microorganisms [21]. Paraquat is the most highly acutely toxic herbicide to be marketed over
50 the last 60 years. Yet it is one of the most widely used herbicides in the world and in most
51 countries where it is registered, it can be used without restriction. It is used on more than 100
52 crops in about 100 countries. Gramoxone, manufactured by Syngenta, is the most common
53 trade name for paraquat, but the herbicide is also sold under many different names by many
54 different manufacturers. Paraquat is used as an herbicide, desiccant, defoliant and plant
55 growth regulator [25]. It is also used for controlling broadleaf weeds and grasses in more than
56 100 different crops, including plantations [12]. Again, it is used as a pre-harvest defoliant or
57 desiccant on crops such as cereals, cotton, beans, hops, sugar cane, pineapple, soy, potatoes,
58 and sunflowers; and as a post-harvest desiccant to speed up removal of spent plants such as
59 tomato plants. Furthermore, it is used for weed control in non-agricultural areas such as
60 roadsides, airports, around commercial buildings, drains, irrigation ditches, and waterways
61 [17]. In Nigeria, especially Mubi local government area of Adamawa State as well as most of
62 the northern part of Nigeria where farming is the major occupation, strict observance of
63 manufacturer's instructions on how to make use of these herbicides are not being adhered to
64 as they are ignorant of its danger to the environment. Natural ways of controlling pests and
65 pathogens of crops which are friendly to the environment have been forfeited by farmers for
66 synthetic herbicides as the synthetic herbicides provide quick solutions to pests or pathogens
67 problems as noted by [5]. The use of paraquat as herbicide of choice in this study was as a
68 result of it being the most widely used herbicide to control broad-leaf weeds and grasses
69 especially in the study area. Therefore, there is need to occasionally assess the effects of this
70 herbicide on micro flora and other soil organisms as reported by [28] so as to know the
71 measures to be taken.

72

73 2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

74 2.1 Study area

75 The study was carried out at Modibbo Adama University of Technology Yola, in the open
76 field of the Department of Plant Science Botanical garden, Girei Local Government Area of
77 Adamawa state, Nigeria. It is located at the North Eastern part of Nigeria and lies between
78 Latitude 7⁰ and 11⁰N of the equator and between longitudes 10⁰ and 14⁰E of the Greenwich
79 meridian. The botanical garden where the study was carried out has sandy-loamy type of soil.
80 The study area has a tropical climate characterized by dry and wet seasons. It has an average
81 annual rainfall of 759mm. The choice of the study area was informed because of the fact
82 that, the area was never applied any herbicide prior to this study.

83 2.2 Experimental design

84 Completely randomized block design (CRBD) was used for the experiment. For each
85 treatment, it was one block which was replicated three times.

86 2.3 Preparation of herbicides

87 The paraquat used was purchased from Jimeta Modern Market Yola, Adamawa State of
88 Nigeria from the recommended dealer of herbicides. The preparation/concentration of the
89 paraquat for application was prepared according to the manufacturer's recommendations. The
90 concentrations prepared were: 0.3 ml/L of water (low concentration), 0.6 ml/L of water
91 (manufacturer's recommended dose) and 0.9 ml/L of water (high dose). Each of the
92 concentrations has three replications.

93 **2.4 Soil Treatment**

94 The soil was treated with concentrations of the herbicide prepared above by using a knapsack
95 sprayer. Polythene bag was used to cover the soil so as to avoid the chemical drifting to the
96 next neighboring blocks/plots thus, avoiding contamination during the treatment. The control
97 blocks were not treated or applied herbicide.

98 **2.5 Sample Collection**

99 The top soil samples were collected at the depth of 0-5 cm from each block of the field during
100 each collection. It was then put into a sterilized polythene bags and were taken to the
101 laboratory for isolation. The soil samples were then made free of large stones and plant debris
102 using 2.0 mm mesh sieve and stored at 4°C before processing [19]. The soil collection was
103 done at two weeks interval for a period of eight weeks.

104 **2.6 Isolation of Microorganisms**

105 **2.6.1 Isolation of Bacteria**

106 Isolation of bacteria was done through serial dilution. 1 g of the soil sample collected from
107 the field was put in a test tube containing 10 ml of distilled water. One (1) ml of the sample
108 solution was then taken from the first test tube and put in the second test tube containing 10
109 ml of distilled water and this continue until the test tube. For this study, dilution 10^{-2} and 10^{-4}
110 were used. For pouring the sample solution on a media, spread method was used. Micro
111 peptide was used in taken 0.5 ml of the sample solution from the desired test tube and
112 dropped on prepared nutrient agar medium plates under sterilized conditions. The inoculated
113 plates were then after sometimes incubated at 37°C for 24-48 hours. After growth was
114 observed, sub-culturing was done for the isolation of pure culture. The pure cultures were

115 then subjected to Gram's staining so as to identify it and characterized based on their
116 morphological and microscopic features using Bergey's manual as described by [9].

117 **2.6.2 Isolation of Fungi**

118 The isolation of fungi was performed using serial dilution. The soil sample solution (dilution
119 10^{-4}) was then pour on a Potato Dextrose Agar (PDA) medium plates prepared under
120 sterilized conditions and was spread using a sterilized glass rod. The inoculated plates were
121 then incubated at room temperature for 5 days. After incubation period, on the presence of
122 visible growth, the pure cultures were then obtained through sub-culturing. Identification and
123 characterization of the fungal species were done based on their morphological and
124 microscopic characters analysis by using taxonomic guides and standard procedures as
125 described and done by [18].

126 **2.6.3 Isolation of Actinomycetes**

127 Isolation and characterization of the actinomycetes were carried out using [3] method.

128 **2.7 Determination of soil pH**

129 The pH of soil sample was determined using pH meter 3150 Jenway model according to the
130 method described by [15].

131 **2.8 Determination of organic matter and organic carbon**

132 Organic carbon and organic matter in the soil was determined using [26] method.

133 **2.9 Statistical Analysis**

134 All data obtained were subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and where there
135 was significance difference, Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) was used to separate the
136 means.

137 3.0 RESULTS

138 3.1 Fungi, Bacteria and Actinomycetes species identified from paraquat treated and 139 control (untreated) soil samples at two (2) weeks after application (WAA)

140 The results of the fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes identification in paraquat treated and
141 untreated (control) soil samples at two weeks after application (WAA) showed that in
142 paraquat low dose (PLD), paraquat recommended dose (PRD), paraquat high dose (PHD) and
143 the control (CON), fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes such as *A. fumigatus*, *Pseudomonas* sp.,
144 and *A. israelis*; *A. flavus*, *E.coli* and *Streptomyces* sp.; *A. corymbifera*, *Pseudomonas* sp. and
145 *A. bovis*; *A. fumigatus*, *A. flavus*, *A. corymbifera*, *A. niger*, *R. stolonifer* and *Micrococcus* sp.
146 and *Streptomyces* sp. respectively were identified (Table 1).

147 3.2 Fungi, Bacteria and Actinomycetes identified from paraquat treated and untreated 148 (control) soil samples at four (4) weeks after application (WAA)

149 At four (4) weeks after application, the fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes identification in
150 paraquat treated and control soil samples showed that, in PLD, PRD, paraquat high PHD and
151 the CON, fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes such as *A. flavus*, *Bacillus* sp. and *A. bovis*; *A.*
152 *niger*, *E. coli* and *A. Israeli*; *R. stolonifer*, *Pseudomonas* sp. and *Streptomyces* sp.; *R.*
153 *stolonifer*, *A. flavus*, *A. niger*, *A. corymbifera*, *A. fumigatus* and *E. coli* and *A. bovis*
154 respectively were identified (Table 1).

155 3.3 Fungi, Bacteria and Actinomycetes identified from paraquat treated and control soil 156 samples at six (6) weeks after application (WAA)

157 The result of the identification revealed the presence of fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes
158 such as *A. niger*, *Staphylococcus* sp. and *A. bovis*; *A. flavus*, *Pseudomonas* sp. and
159 *Streptomyces* sp.; *R. stolonifer*, *E. coli* and *A. israeli*; *A. niger*, *A. flavus*, *R. stolonifer*, *A.*

160 *coymbifera*, *A. fumigatus* and *Bacillus* sp. and *Streptomyces* sp. in PLD, PRD, PHD and
161 CON soil samples respectively (Table 1).

162 **3.3 Fungi, Bacteria and Actinomycetes identified from paraquat treated and control soil** 163 **samples at eight (8) weeks after application (WAA)**

164 Identified from the PLD, PRD, PHD and CON soil samples were fungi such as *R. stolonifer*,
165 *A. flavus*, *A. niger*, and *R. stolonifer*; *A. flavus*, *A. niger*, *A. corymbifera* and *A. fumigatus*
166 respectively. *Bacillus* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Bacillus* sp. and *E. coli* and *A. bovis*,
167 *Streptomyces* sp., *A. Israeli* and *A. bovis* respectively were the bacterial and actinomycetes
168 species identified from the four soil samples (Table 1).

169 **3.4 Effect of Paraquat Treatment on Fungal Count at 2 – 8 Weeks after Application** 170 **(WAA)**

171 At the 2nd WAA of PLD, PRD and PHD, the result showed that the fungal count were
172 significantly higher ($P=.05$) compared to those of the other WAA with 4.00, 3.00 and 4.00 x
173 10⁴ cfu/mg respectively. However, that of PRD was not significantly different ($P=.05$) from
174 those of 4th – 8th WAA. The CON on the other hand, showed the highest fungal count at 6th
175 and 8th WAA with 5.00 and 5.00 x 10⁴ cfu/mg respectively which were significantly different
176 ($P=.05$) from those of 2nd and 4th WAA (Table 2).

177 **3.5 Effect of Paraquat Treatment on Soil Bacterial Population at 2–8 WAA**

178 The bacterial population was significantly the highest ($P=.05$) at the 4th – 8th WAA of PLD,
179 PRD and PHD with 33.20, 32.00 and 32.30 x 10⁴ cfu/mg respectively. The control, however,
180 was at 2nd and 6th WAA recorded the highest population of bacterial with 35.00 and 35.00 x
181 10⁴ cfu/mg respectively (Table 2).

182 **3.6 The Effect of Paraquat Treatment on Actinomycetes Population at 2 – 8 WAA**

183 The population of actinomycetes at the 2nd WAA of PLD and PRD and even the CON were
184 significantly the highest ($P=.05$) with 2.50, 1.40 and 3.48×10^8 cfu/mg respectively. The
185 same thing was observed for PRD at 6th WAA with 6.80×10^8 cfu/mg (Table 2).

186 3.7 The Effect of Paraquat Treatment on Soil Organic Carbon at 2 – 8 WAA

187 In Table 3, the application of paraquat doses recorded the most effective action on the soil
188 organic carbon only at the 4th WAA with 1.34 %, 1.12 % and 1.12 % respectively except for
189 its high dose at the 6th WAA which also had the highest effect (1.10) that was not
190 significantly different ($P=.05$) with that at the 4th WAA. The control, on the other hand,
191 recorded the most effective action at the 6th and 8th WAA with 1.42 % and 1.43 %
192 respectively (Table 3).

193 3.8 The Effect of Paraquat Treatments on Soil Organic Matter at 2 – 8 WAA

194 In Table 3, the application of the different doses of paraquat significantly ($P=.05$) showed the
195 most effective action at the 4th WAA with 1.93%, 1.93% and 1.84% respectively. The
196 control, however, was only effective on the soil organic matter only at the 8th WAA with
197 2.46%.

198 3.9 The Effect of Paraquat Treatment on Soil pH at 2nd - 8th WAA

199 The pH of the soils was at the 2nd WAA significantly ($P=.05$) the highest with 7.39 %, 7.49
200 % and 7.49 % respectively. Similar result was also observed at 6th WAA for PHD with 7.49
201 % which was significantly the same ($P=.05$) with that at the 2nd WAA. The control also was
202 at the 2nd WAA had the highest pH with 7.52 % (Table 3).

203

204

205

206 **Table 1: Fungi, Bacteria and Actinomycetes species identified from paraquat treated**
 207 **and untreated soil samples**

Week Interval	Treated Soil	Fungal Species	Bacterial Species	Actinomycetes Species
2nd WAA	Paraquat Low Dose	<i>Aspergillus fumigatus</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	<i>A. Israeli</i>
	Paraquat Recommended Dose	<i>Aspergillus flavus</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>Streptomyces</i> sp.
	Paraquat High Dose	<i>Absidia corymbifera</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	<i>A. bovis</i>
	Control (untreated soil sample)	<i>A. fumigatus</i> <i>A. flavus</i> <i>A. corymbifera</i> <i>Aspergillus niger</i> <i>Rhizopus stolonifer</i>	<i>Micrococcus</i> sp.	<i>Streptomyces</i> sp.
4th WAA	Paraquat Low Dose	<i>A. flavus</i>	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	<i>A. bovis</i>
	Paraquat Recommended Dose	<i>A. niger</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>A. Israeli</i>
	Paraquat High Dose	<i>R. Stolonifer</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	<i>Streptomyces</i> sp.
	Control (untreated soil sample)	<i>R. stolonifer</i> <i>A. flavus</i> <i>A. niger</i> <i>A. corymbifera</i> <i>A. fumigatus</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>A. bovis</i>
6th WAA	Paraquat Low Dose	<i>A. niger</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i> sp.	<i>A. bovis</i>
	Paraquat Recommended Dose	<i>A. flavus</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	<i>Streptomyces</i> sp.
	Paraquat High Dose	<i>R. stolonifer</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>A. Israelis</i>
	Control (untreated soil sample)	<i>A. niger</i> <i>A. flavus</i> <i>R. stolonifer</i> <i>A. corymbifera</i> <i>A. fumigatus</i>	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	<i>Streptomyces</i> sp.
8th WAA	Paraquat Low Dose	<i>R. stolonifer</i>	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	<i>A. bovis</i>
	Paraquat Recommended Dose	<i>A. flavus</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	<i>Streptomyces</i> sp.

	Paraquat High Dose	<i>A. niger</i>	<i>Bacillus</i> sp.	<i>A. Israelis</i>
	Control (untreated soil sample)	<i>R. stolonifer</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>A. bovis</i>
		<i>A. flavus</i>		
		<i>A. niger</i>		
		<i>A. corymbifera</i>		
		<i>A. fumigates</i>		
208	WAA: Week After Application			
209				

210

Table 2: Effect of paraquat on soil fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes populations

Week	Fungal count (10 ⁴ cfu/mg)				Bacterial Population (10 ⁴ cfu/mg)				Actinomycetes (10 ⁸ cfu/mg)			
	PLD	PRD	PHD	CON	PLD	PRD	PHD	CON	PLD	PRD	PHD	CON
2nd WAA	4.00 ^a	3.00 ^a	4.00 ^a	2.00 ^b	24.00 ^b	16.00 ^c	9.80 ^c	35.00 ^a	2.50 ^a	2.70 ^d	1.40 ^a	3.48 ^a
4th WAA	3.00 ^{ac}	2.00 ^a	1.00 ^b	3.00 ^b	33.20 ^a	15.20 ^c	12.30 ^b	16.40 ^b	0.55 ^c	4.00 ^c	0.12 ^c	0.15 ^c
6th WAA	3.00 ^{ac}	2.00 ^a	2.00 ^b	5.00 ^a	21.40 ^{bc}	32.00 ^a	32.30 ^a	35.00 ^a	1.32 ^b	6.80 ^a	0.17 ^c	2.39 ^b
8th WAA	2.00 ^{bc}	3.00 ^a	2.00 ^b	5.00 ^a	19.00 ^c	20.30 ^b	9.00 ^c	9.50 ^c	0.82 ^c	5.30 ^b	1.23 ^b	2.76 ^b

211

Key: Means with the same superscript(s) along the column are not significantly different at $P=,05$.

212

PLD: Paraquat low dose; **PRD:** Paraquat recommended dose; **PHD:** Paraquat high dose; **CON:** Control; **WAA=** Week After Application

213

214 **Table 3: Effect of paraquat treatment on soil organic carbon, Organic matter and soil pH**

Week	Organic carbon (%)				Organic matter (%)				Soil pH			
	PLD	PRD	PHD	CON	PLD	PRD	PHD	CON	PLD	PRD	PHD	CON
2 nd WAA	0.38 ^d	0.55 ^d	0.38 ^c	0.95 ^c	0.65 ^c	0.95 ^d	0.62 ^d	1.63 ^d	7.39 ^a	7.49 ^a	7.49 ^a	7.52 ^a
4 th WAA	1.34 ^a	1.12 ^a	1.12 ^a	1.07 ^b	1.93 ^a	1.93 ^a	1.84 ^a	2.33 ^c	6.49 ^b	6.81 ^{ac}	6.84 ^{ac}	6.83 ^{ac}
6 th WAA	1.01 ^b	0.99 ^c	1.10 ^a	1.42 ^a	1.62 ^b	1.89 ^b	1.57 ^c	2.44 ^b	5.73 ^{cd}	6.35 ^{bc}	7.49 ^a	6.55 ^{bc}
8 th WAA	0.95 ^c	1.06 ^b	0.94 ^b	1.43 ^a	1.63 ^b	1.82 ^c	1.62 ^b	2.46 ^a	6.23 ^{bd}	6.94 ^{ac}	6.36 ^{bc}	6.74 ^{bc}

215 **Key:** Means with the same superscript(s) along the column are not significantly different at $P=.05$.

216 **PLD:** Paraquat low dose; **PRD:** Paraquat recommended dose; **PHD:** Paraquat high dose; **CON:** Control; **WAA=** Week After Application

217 4.0 DISCUSSION

218 In this study, assessment of fungal species in paraquat untreated (control) soil samples from
219 the 2 – 8 WAA presents fungal species such as *A. fumigatus*, *A. flavus*, *A. niger*, *A.*
220 *corymbifera* and *R. stolonifer* which were found common in all the control soil samples.
221 **Similar** observation was made by [10] in their control soil samples when they determined the
222 effect of atrazine on soil microbes. This occurrence could be attributed to the fungi being well
223 adapted to the soil conditions or probably the health status of the soil as similarly reported by
224 [29] that associated soil microbial activity and content to soil health. Also, the similarity in
225 fungal species isolated in the control soil samples of paraquat (of this study) and atrazine [10]
226 treated soils could be as a result of these studies being carried out in the same study area with
227 probably the same environmental conditions as such factor according to [7] affect soil
228 microbes. On the other hand, fungal species such as *A. fumigatus*, *A. flavus*, *A. corymbifera*,
229 *A. niger* and *R. stolonifer* were found present in the paraquat treated soils with *A. niger*, *A.*
230 *flavus* and *R. stolonifer* being the commonest especially from the 4-8th WAA. This finding
231 was supported by the findings of [4] who reported the presence of *A. niger*, *A. flavus* and
232 *Penicillium* sp. in their herbicides treated soil. However, their findings differ in one of the
233 fungal species identified probably as a result of the differences in the type of agrochemicals,
234 concentrations, mode of applications, environmental conditions and herbicides combination
235 used as these according to [22] and [29] affect soil's microbes content. Apparent from the
236 assessment of the type of fungal species present in the untreated (control) soils of this study
237 was the fact that fungal species, *A. corymbifera*, was not present in the paraquat treated soils
238 especially from 4th – 8th WAA. This could be that the paraquat had a fungicidal effect on the
239 fungi species.

240 The results of the identification of bacteria and actinomycetes present in the treated and control
241 (untreated) soil samples showed that, bacteria such as *Staphylococcus* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Streptococcus*

242 sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *E. coli* and *Micrococcus* sp. were present in both the treated and untreated
243 (control) soil samples with *Pseudomonas* sp. and *E. coli* being the most common in occurrence in the
244 soil samples from the 2nd – 8th WAA. On the other hand, actinomycetes such as *A. bovis*, *A. israelis*,
245 *Streptomyces* sp. were identified and even the commonest in all the WAA.

246 These bacteria and actinomycetes species identified, differ across the number of WAA of the
247 treatments as well as the doses probably as a result of the effect of the chemicals on them. This was so
248 because herbicides could adversely affect soil microbes depending upon the application rate/dose and
249 the type of herbicide used [4, 19]. The bacterial species identified in the treated and control soil
250 samples of this study were similarly reported by [21] in the control and paraquat treated soils.
251 However, some of the bacterial species identified in this study such as *Staphylococcus* sp.,
252 *Streptococcus* sp., and *E. coli* were not reported in their findings probably as a result of the
253 differences in concentration used, period of application and collection of samples for assessment and
254 the depth at which the soil samples were collected.

255 The effect of paraquat treatments on soil fungal count at the 2nd WAA of PLD, PRD and PHD showed
256 a higher fungal count compared to those of other WAA. Similar report was given by [21] who
257 reported a decrease in the fungal count of the soil treated with butachlor, pyrazosulfuron and paraquat
258 with passage of time from 7th to 28th day after treatment. The decrease of the fungal count observed
259 in this study could be due to the adverse effect of the herbicide on the fungal component of the soil.
260 This was proven by the fungal count of the control as the fungal count was higher especially at 6th and
261 8th WAA.

262 Bacterial population was low for most of the paraquat doses at the 2nd WAA, but increased at other
263 WAA. [4] Discovered that higher concentrations of herbicide treatments resulted in much lower
264 microbial counts when compared to soils treated with recommended doses. This study somehow
265 agrees with the above statement because the bacterial population of the control soil samples had the
266 highest compared with those of paraquat treated soils.

Actinomycetes population was high at 2nd WAA of PLD, PRD and the control as well as at the 6th WAA of PHD. This could be influenced by the factors such as temperature, pH, organic carbon content, aeration and moisture content of the soils as reported by [3]. Similar result was published by [21] who reported a significant increase in actinomycetes population from 7th to 28th day as a result of herbicide application.

The behavior of most herbicides is generally influenced by the content of organic carbon [24]. The phenomenon of herbicide leaching was primarily related to the adsorption of herbicides in the different soils, mainly due to their contents of fulvic-acids, humus in the organic fraction of the soils, followed by parameters such as the cat-ion exchange capacity, acid dissociation constant [1]. Variation in the effect of paraquat treated soils on organic carbon content was observed with respect to the doses of the herbicides and the weeks after application. Same was observed for the effect of paraquat on the soil organic matter content as well as pH of the soils. This could be due to vigorous microbial activities in the soil [11].

5.0 CONCLUSION

Different doses of paraquat at different WAA affect soil microbial populations as well the chemical components of the soil. So, the effects of paraquat on soil microbial populations and chemical components depended on the concentrations used and the duration of application. It also determines the type of microbes present in the soil by getting rid of those that cannot withstand its effects, in this way allowing only the resistible species.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alister CA and Kogun G. Effect of chemical properties of five agricultural soils on herbicidesoil adsorption and leaching. *Journal of agricultural and crop production* Santiago. 2011;1(2): 1-8.
- [2] Singh AP and Mishra S. Isolation and Biochemical characterization of antibiotic producing microorganism from waste soil samples of certain industrial areas of India. *Journal of pharmacy and Biological Sciences*. 2013; 5(6):2278-3008.
- [3] Arifuzzama M, Kwatun MR and Rahman H. Isolation and screening of actinomyletes from sundarbans soil for antibacterial activity. *African Journal of Biotechnology*. 2010; 9 (9): 4615-4619.
- [4] Ayansina ADV, Oso BA. Effect of two commonly used herbicides on soil micro flora at two different concentrations. *African Journal Biotechnology*. 2006; 5(2): 129-132.

- 296 [5] Bandala ER, Gelover S, Leal MT, Bulnes CA, Jonenez A, and Estrad CA. Solar photocatytic
297 degradation of Aldrincatal . Today. 2007; 76: 189 -199.
- 298 [6] Benson JM. Weed in tropical crops. Review of Abstracts on constraints in Production
299 caused by weeds in maize, rice, sorghum, millet, groundnut and cassava. Food and
300 agriculture organization (FAO) plant production paper. 1982; 32 (1).
- 301 [7] Bolter M, Bloem J, Meiners K and Mover R. Enumeration and bivolume determination of
302 microbial cells: CABI Publishing, Wallingford, UK; 2006.
- 303 [8] Chauhan AK, Das A, Kharkwal H, Kharkwal AC and Varma A. Impact of
304 microorganisms on environment and health, In: Chauhan AK and Varma A, editors
305 Microbes: Health and environment; 2006.
- 306 [9] Cheesbrough M. District Laboratory Practice Part II. Cambridge, London; 2006.
- 307 [10] Dagze JK, Chimbekujwo IB and Tizhe TD. Determination of microbial population and
308 chemical components of atrazine treated soil. International Journal of Research. 2016; 3(14):
309 765-783.
- 310 [11] Greaves MP, Davies HA, Marsh JAP and Wingfield GL. Herbicides and soil microorganism,
311 CRC Crit. Rev. Microbial. 1976; 6:1-38.
- 312 [12] Gochez, A. Goodbye paraquat: Palm oil, banana and tea producers saying No to hazardous
313 pesticides. <http://www.evb.ch/cm-data/goodbye-paraquat.pdf>
- 314 [13] Guy, E. Learning to learn the fourth generation: making sense of personalized learning
315 FLO: Bristol, 2006 (in Press).
- 316 [14] Kellogg RI, Nebring R, Grube A, Gross DW and Plotkin S. Environmental indicators of
317 pesticides leaching and run- of fromoforam fields. U.S Department of Agriculture and
318 National conservation, 2000. Retrived 14th March 2014. From service,
319 <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/land/pubs/eip.paphtml>.
- 320 [15] Onyeike EN and Osuji JO. Resaerch technique in Biological and Chemical Sciences.
321 Springfield Publishers Limited, 2003.
- 322 [16] Pandey RR, Sharma G, Tripathi SK and Singh AK. Litter fall, litter decomposition and
323 nutrient dynamics in subtropical natural forest and managed plantations in northeastern India.
324 Forest Ecology Management. 2007; 240:96-106.
- 325 [17] PAN Europe. Chemical crustaceans: pesticides and prawn farming. Pesticide News.
326 2003; 59:4. <http://www.pan.uk.org/pestnews/issue/pn59/pn59p4.htm>.
- 327 [18] Rohilla SK and Salar RK. Isolation and characterization of various fungal strains from
328 agricultural soil contaminated with pesticides. Research Journal of Recent Sciences. 2012;
329 1(1): 297-303.
- 330 [19] Sebiomo A, Ogundero VW and Bankole SA. Utilization and soil minerals . Research
331 journal of environmental and Earthsciences. 2011; 4 (6).617-62.
- 332 [20] Shave PA and Avav T. Economic of need management in late planted minimum tillage rice in
333 Benue Nigeria. IRRN. 2004; 29(1) 73-74.

- 334 [21] Stanley HO, Maduiké EM and Okerentugba PO. Effect of herbicide (atrazine and paraquat)
 335 application on soil bacterial population. Sky Journal of Soil science and Environmental Management.
 336 2013; 2(9):101-105.
- 337 [22] Subhani AM, Ayam EC, Huang JX. Effect of pesticides (Herbicides) on soil microbial biomass
 338 review. Pakistan Journal of Biological Science. 2000; 3(5).
- 339 [23] Tripathi SK, Sumida A, Ono K, Shibata H, Uemura S, Kodama Y and Hara T. Leaf litter fall and
 340 decomposition of different above and below ground parts of birch (*Betula ermani*) tree and dwarf
 341 bamboo (*Sasa kurilensis*) shrub in a young secondary forest of Northern Japan. Biology Fertility
 342 Soils. 2006; 43:237-246.
- 343 [24] Torrents A, and Jayasunda S. The sorption of non-tonic pesticides onto clays and the
 344 influence of natural organic carbon chemosphere. 1997; 35:1549-1565.
- 345 [25] United States Environmental Protection Agency. Paraquat dichloride, Registration
 346 eligibility decision. <http://www.epa.gov/oppsrrd1/REDs/0262red.pdf>
- 347 [26] Walkley A and Black IA. An examination of the Degjareff method for determining
 348 organic carbon in soil: Effect of variation in digestion conditions and of inorganic soil
 349 constituents. Soil Science. 1934; 63:251-263.
- 350 [27] Wang QK, Wang SL and Liu YX. Responses to N and P fertilization in a young *Eucalyptus*
 351 *dunni* plantation, microbial properties, enzyme activities and dissolved organic carbon. Applied Soil
 352 Ecology. 2008; 40:484-490.
- 353 [28] Zaid AM, Mayouf M and Faroiy YS. The effect of pre-emergent herbicides soil microflora and
 354 N. fixing bacteria in Pea field. International journal of science: basic and Applied Research. 2014;
 355 15(1):131 -138.
- 356 [29] Zain NMM, Mohammed RB, Siyam K, Morshed MM and Awang Y. Effects of selected
 357 herbicides on soil microbial populations in oil palm plantation of Malaysia: a Microcosm
 358 experiment. African Journal of Microbiology Research. 2013; 5: 367-374.